

## **IMAC-QA Subcommittee Minutes**

### **March 28, 2005**

---

**Members Present:** John Haine, DHFS; Lisa Hanson, DHFS; Pam Lohaus, DHFS, Brian Fangmeier, DHFS; Marcia Williamson, DHFS; Chris Elms, Dane County; Marilyn Rudd, DHFS; Jackie Bennett, Racine County

**Via Conference Call:** Joanne Ator, Door County; Jennifer Winter, Managed Health Services Managed Care

**Absent:** Bernadette Connolly, DHFS; Jacaie Coutant, Milwaukee County; Vicki Jessup, DHFS; Lorie Mueller, La Crosse County

#### **I. Review meeting minutes from February meeting**

Minutes from the February meeting were reviewed. Marcia Williamson moved to accept the minutes, Chris Elms seconded the motion. There were no objections.

#### **II. Food Stamp 2<sup>nd</sup> party review process-Status reports John (Milwaukee) and Lisa (BOS)**

John Haine presented an overview of Milwaukee County's Second Party Review status. Milwaukee has not fully implemented a Second Party review process; this is based on February 2005 data, they were at 40 – 50% compliance.

Payment Accuracy Consultants (PAC) were assigned to “third party” cases reviewed by a Supervisor. Because the second party process has not been fully implemented, PAC have shifted their focus and are reviewing applications/reviews/SMIRFS. Fifteen staff have been identified with the highest error rates and PAC completed “Find & Fix” reviews of their cases. Since this started several of the original 15 workers no longer require this review and other workers have been added.

Lisa Hanson reported on Second Party Reviews for the balance of the state at our last meeting. The following is a summary of her IMQA Second Party data.

| <b>Percent Entered</b> | <b>2004<br/>No. of Agencies</b> | <b>2005<br/>No. of Agencies</b> |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 0% - 25%               | 25                              | 32                              |
| 26% - 50%              | 11                              | 9                               |
| 51% - 75%              | 23                              | 12                              |
| 76% - 100%             | 20                              | 26                              |

8 agencies have entered no reviews for 2004 or 2005.

25 agencies have no reviews or less than 1% for 2005.

17 agencies have 100%+ for 2005.

Based on the above information, our workgroup recommended – (1) John discuss the importance of the Second Party Review process at local forums, (2) Lisa provide training at Regional meetings, (3) A status report be provided to the IMAC and (4) Area Coordinator's share Lisa's data with their agencies.

Numbers 1, 3 & 4 have occurred. John Haine has started to attend Regional Forums to discuss payment accuracy and the value of second party reviews.

Cheryl McIlquham presented the above data during the March 17<sup>th</sup> IMAC meeting and asked for input from the membership. All agreed that they saw great value in completing Second Party Reviews but found with their current caseload growth and budgeting issues, it is difficult to accomplish.

Area Coordinators have begun sharing Lisa's data with their agencies, particularly their MER agencies. Pam Lohaus said she intended to use this data when she completed on-site reviews.

Lisa has been gathering information from additional agencies, those not doing well and those doing well. Agencies not doing well indicated that the reason for not entering data was due to staffing issues; they had a lot of people leaving. Others said that they did not have access to IMQA. Agencies doing well said that they view this process as routine program administration, not extra workload.

Joanne Ator shared IMQA system related problems that she found. She recommended additional training be provide to agencies to provide a better understanding of data entry. She felt this would improve its use.

We concluded that it would be optimal if Lisa could attend Regional meetings and provide IMQA training. If travel costs make that prohibitive, then development of teleconference training could fill that void. Either approach would benefit both the agencies and the state.

We next discussed the "Find and Fix" tool. Some agencies found it difficult to switch to the new review tool. Those agencies were more comfortable completing full reviews and didn't believe the shorter tool was comprehensive enough. From the state's perspective, the shorter tool fulfills the goal of second party reviews to assure payment accuracy. When an error, outside the 5 identified error elements, is found, the agencies are expected to address it as well.

How should agencies calculate the number of FoodShare reviews required each month? Lisa has been having a discussion with one agency about this calculation. DHFS requested that agencies review 2 cases per worker, per month. DHFS allowed agency's flexibility in terms of whose cases were reviewed as long as the total number was equivalent to 2 per worker. The workgroup concluded that we should continue using that methodology. Future QAPs should allow a Supervisor caseload to be exempt. We need to emphasize that the total is primarily to provide the state with a baseline figure.

### **III. Current FS error rate – Lisa**

The Midwest Regional Office tracks the error rates of all the states within its region. Looking at October and November data Wisconsin has the lowest error rate, we are at 4.41%. The national average is 5.58%.

Agencies issuing 10 million in benefits with a sampling of 30 cases are eligible for Big Ten awards. At this time, both Racine and Dane Counties are in the running.

Wisconsin is currently ranked number 47 for its negative case error rate. Our October and November error rate is 8%. The national average is 4.85%.

### **IV. QAP plans for 2006, discussion on content - Marilyn**

Quality Assurance Plans are required through the Income Maintenance contracts. In CY 2004 our workgroup developed Administrator's Memo 03-11 to more fully define what should be included in Quality Assurance Plans (QAPs).

To aid in this discussion, Administrator's Memo 03-11 was edited and shared with our members.

The language surrounding Medicaid Second Party Reviews for 2006 was our first discussion item. In 2006 the Department's budget request asked for additional administrative funding for Medicaid second party reviews. This money was to provide additional dollars for second partying 2 Medicaid-only cases per worker, per month. It will now mirror the FoodShare requirement.

Our workgroup agreed that we would table this discussion until our April meeting. We will invite Scott Riedasch to our meeting. Scott's section is responsible for development of the tool and reporting format for Medicaid Second Party reviewing. Vicki Jessup will be attending that meeting as well, and as our MEQC Unit Lead, her presence will also assure a fuller discussion.

Key topics of discussions around FoodShare and the QAP for 2006 were:

(1) Should use of the IMQA case list be discretionary?

- This list is a time saver since, for larger agencies particularly, pulling cases that are recent applications or reviews is very time consuming. However, at this time, the IMQA list needs some fine-tuning to provide sufficient cases and not over-sample the "wrong" people.

Conclusion: Continue to allow agency flexibility. Agencies can describe the methodology they will apply to drawing Second Party cases within their Quality Assurance Plan (QAP). The QAPs are reviewed and approved by the

Regional Area Coordinator and central office staff so, we can collect data and track the effectiveness of each plan.

(2) Include timeliness process reporting and report through IMQA?

- The difficulty in determining timely processing is not at application or review but when a client requests assistance for an ongoing case. Currently timeliness reports exist on EOS and should be available for Webi as well. Perhaps ACD should be explored for reporting or possible reporting.

Conclusion: None. This will require greater discussion. This will be an agenda item as we continue to develop QAP criteria.

Next month we will focus on the Medicaid section of the QAP.

Chris Elms requested that Benefit Recovery be added to our list of future discussion topics.

**Minutes for April meeting to be taken by: Lisa**

**Dial in at:**

**Local- 316-0022**

**Toll Free Number: 888-677-9189**

**Passcode: 1671#**